

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 18-20, and 22-27 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 18, and 19 have been amended. Claims 23-27 have been added. The claim amendments and new claims are supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

This Supplemental Amendment is further to Applicant's March 1, 2010 Amendment After Final and June 1, 2010 Request for Continued Examination, both of which are incorporated herein by reference.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicant's representative, Brent G. Seitz, thanks Examiner Hinze for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of June 22, 2010. Differences between Applicant's invention and the art were discussed. The Examiner agreed that amending the claims to recite "active" drying will overcome the current rejections because this feature is not anticipated by, or obvious in view of, the art of record.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6, 9-13, 16, and 18-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lappe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,565,054) in view of Vaughn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,983,686). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below, as well as those set forth in Applicant's March 1, 2010

Amendment After Final and June 1, 2010 Request for Continued Examination, which are both incorporated herein by reference.

Amended independent Claims 1, 18, and 19 each recite “active” drying. Claim 18 further recites a drying unit “including one of ventilator blowing or infrared radiation.” Claim 1 further recites that the claimed steps are carried out in “one continuous sequence” and that “the order and frequency of the steps of the method are configured to be varied arbitrarily.”

The Office Action asserts that Lappe discloses drying *via* natural air drying between processing steps. But both Lappe and Vaughn fail to disclose, and their combination fails to suggest, “active” drying, as agreed by the Examiner during the telephonic interview. The references also fail to disclose or suggest a drying unit including “ventilator blowing or infrared radiation,” as set forth in Claim 18. Finally, the references fail to disclose or suggest that their printing and embossing method is a continuous sequence that can be “varied arbitrarily,” as set forth in amended Claim 1.

Therefore, combination of Lappe and Vaughn fails to render amended Claims 1, 18, and 19 obvious, as the Examiner agreed during the telephonic interview. Applicant thus respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of Claims 1, 18, and 19 (as well as those claims dependent therefrom) for the reasons set forth above, in Applicant’s Amendment After Final, and the RCE.

NEW CLAIMS

New Claims 23-27 have been added. The new claims are supported by the application as filed and do not present new subject matter. For example, Claims 23-27 are supported by at least Figures 1-3 and pages 15-16 of the application as filed. Applicant thus respectfully requests entry and consideration of the new claims.

The new claims are not anticipated by, or obvious in view of, the cited art. For example, in addition to not disclosing “active” drying as explained above, the cited art fails to disclose or suggest “completely” drying the adhesive layer, as set forth in new dependent Claim 23.

Claim 24 recites “drying with at least one of infrared radiation and ventilator blowing.” Claim 27 recites “the drying unit includes one of ventilator blowing or infrared radiation.” The cited art fails to disclose or suggest drying with either infrared radiation or ventilator blowing.

Claim 25 recites, with reference to Figures 1-3 for example, “the drying device [26] includes a first part [27] on a first side of the print products and a second part [28] on a second side...that is opposite to the first side.” The cited art fails to disclose or suggest a drying device with such an arrangement.

Claim 26 recites that the coating of the adhesive layer, embossing, and color printing “are all executed at a single location.” In contrast, Vaughn discloses, with reference to Figure 1, printing 30 and embossing 20 at different locations only, which eliminates the need for the claimed drying. Vaughn thus

fails to disclose or suggest, and in fact teaches away from, printing and embossing at the same location as claimed.

Applicant thus respectfully requests consideration and allowance of new dependent Claims 23-27.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 12, 2010

By: / G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BGS

15575786.1